

Appl. No. 09/848,158
Arndt, dated Dec. 23, 2004
Reply to Office action of December 30, 2003
Page 11 of 13

REMARKS

The applicant would like to acknowledge, with thanks, the Office Action of September 27, 2004. Claims 28-42 and 52-68 were pending in the application. Claims 24-42 and 52-65 stand rejected. Claims 66-68 were allowed. Reconsideration of the above-indicated patent application, as amended, is respectfully requested. Accordingly, various claims have been added, amended or cancelled and supporting remarks are presented herewith that particularly point out and distinctly claim the subject matter that applicant regards as his invention. Specifically, claims 28 and 57 have been amended, claims 42, 52-53 and 55-56 have been cancelled, and claims 69-72 have been added.

I. **Claims 28-41, 54, 57-65, and 69-72 are patentable under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) over the cited prior art.**

The Examiner had rejected claims 28-30, 34-38, 40-41 and 52-65 under Section 103(a) as being unpatentable over PCT Publication WO 00/17984 to Woolard et al. (Woolard) in view of U.S. Patent No. 6,236,332 to Conkright et al. (Conkright), and U.S. Patent No. 6,725,106 to Covington et al. (Covington). Withdrawal of this rejection is requested based on at least the reasons set forth below.

Independent claim 28 as now amended recites a redundant communication system coupling the primary processing system to the redundant secondary processing system when the global communication packet switched network fails. Independent claim 57 as now amended recites the accessing the airfield system information from the central control center via a redundant communication system when the global communication network fails. Neither Woolard, Conkright nor Covington, alone or in combination teach suggest or show this element. Furthermore, claims 69 and 71 recite that the redundant communication system is one of a wired and wireless communication system; and claims 70 and 72 recite that the redundant communication system comprises a wired communication means and a wireless communication means, which the cited prior art also does not teach, suggest or show.

Appl. No. 09/848,158
Amdt. dated Dec. 23, 2004
Reply to Office action of December 30, 2003
Page 12 of 13

Therefore for the reasons just set forth above, independent claims 28 and 57 and dependent claims 69-72 should be patentable over the cited prior art. In addition, claims 29-41, 54 and 58-65 are directly dependent from these claims and therefore contain each and every element of these claims. Thus, for the reasons already set forth for claims 28 and 57 claims 29-41, 54, 58-65, and 69-72 should also be patentable over the cited prior art.

Claims 31-32 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being unpatentable based on the combination of Woolard, Conkright, Covington and PCT Publication WO 01/22177 to Townsend (hereinafter Townsend). Claims 31-32 depend directly from claim 28, and therefore contain each and every element of claim 28. Therefore, for the reasons already set forth for claim 28, claims 31-32 are patentable over the cited prior art.

Claims 33 and 39 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being unpatentable based on the combination of Woolard, Conkright, Covington, and PCT Publication WO 00/62136 to Steen et al. Claims 33 and 39 depend directly from claim 28, and therefore contain each and every element of claim 28. Therefore, for the reasons already set forth for claim 28, claims 31-32 are patentable over the cited prior art.

Claim 42 was rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being unpatentable based on the combination of Woolard, Conkright, Covington, and Runyon (U.S. Pat. No. 5,969,642). Claim 42 has been canceled without prejudice or disclaimer.

CONCLUSION

In view of the foregoing it is respectfully submitted that the present application distinguishes over the prior art, and a notice of allowance is earnestly solicited. If the Examiner believes there are any further matters, which need to be discussed in order to expedite the prosecution of the present application, the Examiner is invited to contact the undersigned.


If there are any fees necessitated by the foregoing communication, please charge such fees to our Deposit Account No. 50-0902, referencing our Docket No. 74953/11664.

Appl. No. 09/848,158
Amdt. dated Dec. 23, 2004
Reply to Office action of December 30, 2003
Page 13 of 13

Respectfully submitted,

TUCKER ELLIS & WEST LLP

Date: 12-23-2004



Larry B. Donovan
Registration No. 47,230
Customer No. 23380
1150 Huntington Building
925 Euclid Avenue
Cleveland, Ohio 44115-1475
(216) 696-3340 (phone)
(216) 592-5009 (fax)

CERTIFICATE OF FACSIMILE TRANSMISSION

I hereby certify that this correspondence (along with any paper referenced as being attached or enclosed) is being faxed to fax no. (703) 872-9306 on the below date to Mail Stop Amendment, Assistant Commissioner for Patents, Alexandria, VA 22313-1450..

Date: 12/23/04

by: 
Name: Amy E. Gagich

74933/11664/815160/1